
FOR REFERENCE ONLY

Note: This document will be revised prior to Phase A Kickoff.

NEW FRONTIERS

CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES

FOR THE

PHASE A CONCEPT STUDY

February 12, 2003

CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES FOR THE PHASE A CONCEPT STUDY

INTRODUCTION

It is planned that a subset of proposed investigations from the New Frontiers AO be selected and awarded contracts to conduct Phase A concept studies. The Phase A concept study for each investigation will constitute the investigation's requirements definition phase (Phase A) of the formulation subprocess as outlined in NPG 7120.5B, *NASA Program and Project Management Processes and Requirements*. The purpose of a Phase A concept study is to better define the investigation, its implementation requirements, and its risks, as well as to describe the implementation plans for education and public outreach, small disadvantaged businesses, and technology infusion/transfer. The Phase A Concept study period can also be utilized to mature the proposal concept presented in response to the AO by demonstrating proof of concept and/or conducting additional development testing to reduce/retire risks. In addition, it is expected that the proposer will utilize the Phase A concept study period to refine requirements and project interfaces with the New Frontiers Program Office (NFPO), the Kennedy Space Center (KSC) ELV office, the JPL Interplanetary Network Directorate (formerly TMOD), and other critical support functions. Signed Letters of Endorsement from each of these critical support elements are mandatory to provide assurance that the project's requirements have been assessed and are supportable. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the Phase A period should be utilized to finalize all cost estimates, and develop the needed project funding profile necessary to implement the investigation with an acceptable level of risk. The project cost proposed at the completion of Phase A is the cost that New Frontiers proposal teams will be expected to meet for the entire life of the project. Any subsequent increase in this cost without the full endorsement of the NFPO at NASA Headquarters will be grounds for cancellation of the project.

Upon completion of the Phase A concept study, proposers will submit a Concept Study Report (CSR) for NASA evaluation. The CSR is to be a self-contained document; that is, selected investigators should not assume that NASA evaluators will have reviewed or even have access to the original proposal. Please note that all program constraints, guidelines, definitions, and requirements given in the AO are still valid for the CSR except as noted herein. Likewise, specific guidelines and definitions for proposal preparation are still valid for the CSR except where specifically amended in this document (for example, page counts are amended herein to account for the added degree of expected maturity of the investigation's implementation).

Proposers should be aware that they are responsible for the content and quality of the entire CSR, including parts that may be prepared by any of their partners. All assumptions and calculations should be carefully documented in the CSR and reviewed by the Principal Investigator and his/her team to ensure that they are accurate and will satisfy the requirements of NASA and its supporting organizations.

In addition to the CSR, the evaluation process will also include a site visit by the evaluation team to hear oral briefings by each of the investigation teams. These visits will

be announced and scheduled at a Phase A Kickoff meeting to be held at NASA Headquarters in Washington DC subsequent to AO selection. For planning purposes, these oral briefings can be expected to last one full workday and would be conducted about 1 month after CSR submit.

It is recognized that New Frontiers investigations are subject to three kinds of risks: inherent risks (including launch and space environments, mission durations, technology extensions, and unknowns); programmatic risks (those uncertainties imposed by the program such as Environmental Assessment approvals, budget uncertainties/changes, political impacts, and late/non-delivery of government-provided project elements) and implementation risks (those elements under the control of the investigation team including such things as schedules, funding, management structure, development approach, supporting organizations, and risk aversion/management approach including planning for known and unknown inherent and programmatic risks). The primary purpose of the Phase A concept study is to develop detailed implementation plans for the proposed investigation so that the this third kind of risk, implementation risk, can be judged.

Part I of this document discusses the criteria to be used by NASA for the evaluation of the CSR. Part II provides guidance for preparation of the CSR. Guidelines for the project site visits will be presented at the Phase A Kickoff Meeting at NASA HQ

As a result of the evaluation of the Concept Studies, the Associate Administrator for Space Science expects to confirm at least one New Frontiers mission investigation to proceed to Phase B. NASA will not continue funding for investigations that are not selected to proceed. All investigation teams will be offered a debriefing of all findings. The investigation team(s) who are confirmed will be provided a debriefing of all findings and instructions by the New Frontiers Program Office.

PART I - EVALUATION CRITERIA

The NASA evaluation process of the Phase A concept studies will be conducted in much the same fashion as the evaluation of the proposals as discussed in Section 7.0 of the AO with the exception that Categorization will no longer be required. Also, since the selected investigations are those judged to having compelling science, it is expected that the science objectives would not change during the Phase A studies. If, however, there are changes to the science implementation that might affect these objectives, the science merit will be re-evaluated. Assuming that there are no changes to the science objectives from those in the proposal, the Phase A evaluation will primarily be to evaluate all of the implementation planning for each investigation and consider in detail all factors related to the probability of mission success and to the realism of the proposed costs to NASA. This evaluation will also consider other factors that enhance the return on NASA's investment in the investigation such as the infusion and/or transfer of technologies, education and public outreach, and small disadvantaged business activities. It is expected that plans for these elements of the investigations will be defined to the next level of detail and maturity along with the development of the science, engineering, and cost.

Successful implementation of New Frontiers investigations demand, in addition to scientific merit, that the investigation be achievable within the established constraints on cost and schedule. The information requested in Part II of this document will enable the evaluation panel to determine how well each mission team understands the complexity of its proposed investigation, its technical risks, and any weaknesses that require specific action during Phase B.

The criteria to be used for evaluation of the Concept Study Report are as follows:

- The scientific merit of the investigation (will not be re-evaluated unless it is determined that the science has changed from that described in the proposal)
- The technical merit and feasibility of the proposed investigation
- The feasibility of the proposed approach for mission implementation, including cost risk (i.e., realism and reasonableness of cost)
- The quality of plans for education and public outreach including implementation feasibility
- The quality of plans for a) technology infusion and/or transfer and b) small disadvantaged business activities and the implementation feasibility of the respective plans

Scientific Merit of the Investigation.

It is expected that the science objectives will not change from those given in the proposal. The scientific merit of each investigation as established by the peer review of the proposal will be, however, reexamined to determine if significant changes have occurred as a result of details provided in the Phase A Concept Study Report with regards to the implementation details of the science investigation. If a re-evaluation is judged to be necessary, the definitions and process for evaluating this criterion will be the same as those used for the phase one peer review. Given no change in the science, the peer review panel rating from the proposal will remain valid for the CSR.

Technical Merit and Feasibility of the Proposed Investigation

The information provided in response to Part II of this document will be used to evaluate each investigation in detail for its technical merit, scientific feasibility, resiliency, and probability of success. Although this criterion was evaluated during the proposal phase, it will be re-evaluated during this Phase A concept study which now will have science implementation details for evaluation. As a result, the evaluation of this AO criterion will be supplemented with the following considerations:

The scientific implementation of the investigation will be reevaluated from the data provided in the Concept Study Report and the site visit to look specifically at the level of implementation risk based on the feasibility of the investigation's technical approach, instrumentation provided to acquire the data, plans for science operations and data acquisition, plans for science descope, technical capabilities of the investigation team, and the plans for data analysis and archiving.

The evaluation results will be an assessment of science implementation risk (High, Medium, or Low).

Feasibility of the Proposed Approach for Mission Implementation, including Cost Risk

The information provided in response to Part II of this document will be used to evaluate each investigation in detail for the feasibility of mission implementation as reflected in the perceived risk of accomplishing the mission within proposed resources. The mission feasibility as whole and as reflected in the subfactors (technical approach, management and organization, and cost) will be assessed as well as each of these subfactors separately. This AO criterion will be supplemented with the following considerations:

The evaluation will consider the proposer's understanding of the processes, products, and activities required to accomplish development of all elements (e.g., mission design, launch systems, flight systems, communications systems, ground and data systems, etc.), the integration of all elements, and the adequacy of the proposed approach including reserves and margins. The technical approach will be examined in its entirety to ensure that: (1) all elements and processes are addressed, (2) weaknesses and design issues are understood and plans for resolution have been identified, (3) fundamental design trades have been identified and studies planned and (4) primary

performance parameters have been identified and minimum thresholds established. The overall technical approach (including a well-defined schedule), the specific design concepts, and the known hardware/software will be evaluated for soundness, achievability, and maturity. Resiliency and design performance margins will be factors in this evaluation. Proposers should address how developmental problems with new technology will be addressed in order to ensure mission success. The experience and expertise of the development organizations will be important factors in assessing the probability of success. Innovative cost effective features, processes, or approaches will be rewarded if proven sound.

The information provided in the Management section should demonstrate the proposer's plans, processes, tools, and organization for managing and controlling the development and operation of the mission, including performance measurement and reporting. The soundness and completeness of the implementation approach as defined in a Work Breakdown Structure (WBS), and the probability that the investigation team can assure mission success will be evaluated by reviewing the organizational structure (including roles, responsibilities, accountability, and decision making process) and the processes, plans, and strategies the team will use to manage the various mission elements. Factors in this evaluation will include: clear lines of authority, clean interfaces, prudent scheduling and cost control mechanisms, review processes, and demonstrated awareness of all necessary management processes. The adequacy with which risk management activities are planned and budgeted incorporating the recommendations of the NASA Integrated Action Team (NIAT) Report, are also factored into this evaluation. Additional factors in the evaluation of the probability of mission success will include the experience, expertise, and commitment of key personnel and the organizations to which they are attached, the adequacy of facilities and equipment proposed for the mission, the adequacy of the team's approach to risk management, and the adequacy of the management and control mechanism. Innovative management processes and plans will be rewarded if proven to be sound.

The completeness of the Phase B plans will also be considered in determining the adequacy of the overall implementation approach. This will include an evaluation of the activities/products, the organizations responsible for those activities/products, and the detailed schedule to accomplish the activities/products.

The credibility and realism of the proposed cost estimates and the planned financial resiliency will be evaluated. The underlying rationales for the cost estimates, including cost reserves, technical reserves and margins, and the development schedule, including schedule margins, will be factors in this evaluation.

The evaluation results will be an assessment of mission implementation risk (High, Medium, or Low).

Quality of Plans for Education and Public Outreach including Implementation Feasibility

All proposed investigations must include an Education/Public Outreach component that will be submitted in conjunction with their Concept Study Report. The criteria to be used

to evaluate the E/PO component and a discussion of those criteria is given in the document *Explanatory Guide to the NASA Office of Space Science Education and Public Outreach Evaluation Criteria* (April 1999) which may be found by linking through the Education and Public Outreach Web site at the URL <http://spacescience.nasa.gov>. See section 5.6 of the AO for further details on the E/PO requirements.

Quality of Plans for a) Technology Infusion and/or Transfer and b) Small Disadvantaged Business Activities and the Implementation Feasibility of the Respective Plans

The specific plans for implementing technology infusion and transfer considerations into the investigation as deemed appropriate will be reviewed to determine the extent to which it meets the requirements given in section 5.7 of the AO.

The plans to involve small disadvantaged businesses, women-owned small businesses (WOSB's), historically black colleges and universities (HBCU's), and other minority institutions (MI's) in the implementation of the investigation will be evaluated to determine the extent to which it meets the participation requirements and goals given in section 5.8 of the AO.

PART II

REQUIRED QUANTITIES, MEDIA, FORMAT, AND CONTENT

Forty paper copies of the Concept Study Report are required. In addition, the complete CSR including appendices and all cost data must be provided in searchable PDF and/or Microsoft Word format on a Compact Disk – Read Only Memory (CD-ROM). Forty copies of the CD-ROM are required. The required uniform format and contents are summarized below. Failure to follow this outline may result in reduced ratings during the evaluation process and could lead to the investigation not being confirmed for continuation.

When changes from the original proposal have been made to the science investigation (including science implementation) as a result of the concept study, these changes from the proposal must be clearly identified. See sections E and F for information on highlighting changes.

The content of each requirement is discussed in the subsequent paragraphs. Note that all program constraints, guidelines, requirements, and definitions given in the AO are still valid for the Concept Study Report except as noted herein.

The CSR shall contain no more than 132 pages, including no more than seven foldout pages (28 x 43 cm; i.e., 11 x 17 inches). Three-ring binders may be used.

- A foldout page counts as one page
- All pages other than foldout pages shall be 8.5 x 11 inches or A4 European Standard
- Single- or double-column format is acceptable.
- In complying with the page limit, no page may contain more than 55 lines of text and the type font must not be smaller than 12-point except within figures and tables, where the type font must not be smaller than 10-point.

The following page limits apply:

Section	Page Limit
A. Cover Page and Investigation Summary	As needed
B. Table of Contents	2
C. Fact Sheet	2
D. Executive Summary	5
E. Science Investigation (changes highlighted)	35
F. Technical Approach G. Management Plan H. Education, Public Outreach, Technology Infusion/Transfer, and Small Disadvantaged Business Plans I. Phase B Plan	118
J. Cost Information for Phase A through E: Cost Proposal for Phase B Cost Estimate for Phase C/D Cost Estimate for Phase E Estimate for Total Mission Cost	No page limit, but data must be presented in formats described; be brief
K. Appendices (No other appendices permitted) Letters of Endorsement Relevant Experience and Past Performance Resumes Statement(s) of Work for Each Contract Option Mission Definition and Requirements Agreement Radioactive Power Sources Plan (as applicable) Planetary Protection Approach Any Incentive Plan(s) Any NASA PI Proposing Team Technical Content of Any International Agreements Discussion on Compliance with U.S. Export Laws and Regulations – Update from Proposal Additional Activities in response to 7120.5B Communications Link Budget Design Data Cost and Pricing for Phase B Contract Additional Cost Data to assist Validation Science Change Matrix Data Management Plan Approach Project Plan Approach Orbital Debris Analysis Reference List (Optional) Abbreviations/Acronyms List	No page limit, but small size encouraged

A. COVER PAGE AND INVESTIGATION SUMMARY

The guidelines in the AO, Appendix B, apply.

B. TABLE OF CONTENTS

The CSR shall contain a table of contents that parallel the outline provided in Sections C through K below.

C. FACT SHEET

A Fact Sheet that provides a brief summary of the proposed investigation must be included. The information conveyed on the Fact Sheet should include the following: science objectives (including the importance of the science to the NASA science themes), mission overview (including mission objectives and major mission characteristics), science payload, key spacecraft characteristics, anticipated launch vehicle, major elements of the E/PO program, mission management (including teaming arrangement as known), schedule, and cost estimate. Other relevant information, including figures or drawings, may be included at the proposer's discretion. The Fact Sheet is restricted to two pages (preferably a double-sided single sheet).

D. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Executive Summary is to be a summary of the contents of the CSR and is to include an overview of the proposed baseline investigation including its scientific objectives, the technical approach, management plan, cost estimate, education and public outreach, technology, and small disadvantaged business plans. The Executive Summary should be no more than 5 pages in length.

E. SCIENCE INVESTIGATION

This section shall describe the science investigation resulting from the Phase A Concept Study. Any descoping of, or changes to, the investigation from the baseline and minimum mission science defined in the proposal must be identified in this section. Changes may be highlighted in bold with column marking for easy identification. In addition, a change matrix giving the original (proposed) requirement, the new requirement, rationale for the change, and its location within the CSR is required as an appendix (see section K). If there are no changes, to the science investigation section must be repeated identically from the proposal with a statement that there are no changes.

F. TECHNICAL APPROACH

The Technical Approach section should detail the method and procedures for investigation definition, design, development, testing, integration, ground operations, and flight operations. Proposers must provide a sufficient level of detail to allow NASA to validate all aspects of the mission concept. Failure to provide sufficient detail could cause NASA to be unable to validate the concept, which could result in a High Risk rating. A discussion of all new technologies planned for the investigation

should be provided and include backup plans with scheduled decision criteria if those technologies cannot be made ready. This section should also detail the expected products and end items associated with each phase. Mission teams have the freedom to use their own processes, procedures, and methods. The use of innovative processes, techniques, and activities by mission teams in accomplishing their objectives is encouraged when cost, schedule, technical improvements, and risk containment can be demonstrated. The benefits and risks, if any, of any such processes and products should be discussed. This section must be complete in itself without the need to request additional data, although duplications may be avoided by reference to other sections of the CSR if necessary.

For Missions of Opportunity, provide the information that is related to the proposed investigation's requirements on and interfaces with the sponsor's instrument/spacecraft. NASA will not be evaluating the sponsoring mission design, launch system, nor spacecraft, however, it must have sufficient data about these to understand how the NASA funded project will be implemented.

1. Technical Approach Overview. This section should provide a brief overview of the technical approach including its key challenges.
2. Mission Design. This section should fully describe the operational phase of the mission from launch to end of mission. It should include information on the proposed launch date (including any launch date flexibility), launch location and vehicle, trajectories, Delta-V requirements, orbit characteristics, encounter geometry (orbiter, flyby, lander, etc.) and characteristics (flyby speed, orbital period, etc.), mission duration, and a preliminary mission timeline indicating periods of data acquisition, data downlink, etc. The mission design should also describe DSN or other communications network to be used and interface requirements, along with potential impacts or conflicts with other users of the selected communications resources. Describe any design trade studies conducted or planned. Any trade studies involving launch vehicles must still require that NASA be the launch service provider unless it is to be a contribution. In such cases, the AO guidelines and constraints for both contributions and launch vehicles will be applicable.

A "traceability matrix" showing how the proposed mission design complies with the stated objectives, requirements, and constraints of the proposed investigation, including planetary protection compliance, should be included. The rationale for the selection of launch vehicle should be included. The concept study should identify any innovative features of the mission design that minimize total mission costs.

3. Spacecraft. This section should describe the spacecraft design/development approach, particularly as it relates to new versus existing hardware and redundant versus single-string hardware. It should fully identify the spacecraft systems and describe their characteristics and requirements. A description of the flight system design with a block diagram showing the flight subsystems and their interfaces should be included, along with a description of the flight software and the approach for its development, and a summary of the estimated

performance of the flight system. The flight heritage or rationale used to select the flight system and its subsystems, major assemblies, and interfaces should be described. The discussion of heritage should address two important issues: (1) prior flight experience or flight-qualified design of specific subsystem components, and (2) overall subsystem design, whether new, modified, or exact repeat of a design flown previously. Assumptions about potential cost savings that result from heritage will be quantified and explained in the Cost Proposal section (Section J) below. This section should also discuss the design *process* used: trade studies, simulations, technology development, engineering models, prototypes, etc.

Subsystem characteristics, requirements, and expected performance should be described to the greatest extent possible. Such characteristics include current best estimate and contingency for: mass, volume, and power requirements; performance; pointing knowledge and accuracy; new developments needed; space qualification plan; logistics support; and expected degradation/losses. These subsystems include: structural/mechanical, solar array/power supply (and batteries), electrical, thermal control, propulsion, communications, attitude control, command, and data handling, etc. Include block diagrams with sufficient detail to allow NASA to determine the adequacy of the proposed subsystem.

Any design features incorporated to effect cost savings should be identified; however, benefits should be specified and enabling assumptions or risks should be identified. A summary of the resource elements of the flight systems design concept, including key margins, should be provided. The rationale for, and derivation of, margin allocations including mass, power, communication link performance (data and carrier), pointing accuracy, etc., should be provided. Those design margins that are driving costs should be identified. Provide data in tables to show the current estimate of data storage margin and computer processor utilization margin. A Master Equipment List should summarize component-level information for all hardware subsystems of the spacecraft, any other hardware elements (e.g., probes, canisters, etc.).

4. Science Implementation. This section should describe the science implementation for the investigation. Highlight any changes to the payload or individual instruments or their performance since submission of the proposal and provide a summary in the Science Change Matrix (see section K). Information pertinent to the accommodation of the instrumentation on the spacecraft should also be included. Subsystem characteristics and requirements should be described. Such characteristics include: mass, volume, and power requirements; pointing requirements; new developments needed; and a space qualification plan. Include where appropriate: block diagrams, layouts, calibration plans, operational and control considerations, and software development. Any design features incorporated to effect cost savings should be identified. A summary of the resource elements of the instrument design concept, including key margins, should be provided. The rationale for margin allocation should be provided. Those design margins that are driving costs

should be identified. The Master Equipment List should summarize component-level information for each instrument, including payload common elements.

Special attention should be given to assuring that both the planning and resources are adequate to analyze, interpret, and archive all the data produced by the investigation in the appropriate data archive (Planetary Data System or other, as justified). Resources include cost, schedule, and man-hours for scientific interpretation of results and publication.

5. Payload Integration. This section should characterize the interface between the instruments and the flight system. These include, but are not limited to: volumetric envelope, fields of view, weight, power requirements, thermal requirements, command and telemetry requirements, sensitivity to or generation of contamination (e.g., electromagnetic interference, gaseous effluents, etc.), data processing requirements, as well as the planned process for physically and analytically integrating them with the flight system. The testing strategy of the science payload, prior to integration with the spacecraft, should be discussed.
6. Manufacturing, Integration, and Test. This section should describe the manufacturing strategy to produce, test, and verify the hardware/software necessary to accomplish the mission. It should include a description of the main processes/procedures planned in the fabrication of flight hardware, software, production personnel resources, incorporation of new technology/materials, and the preliminary test and verification program. The environmental tests planned should be discussed and proposed test margins and durations for the environmental test program specified. Part burn-in requirements that will be used for the program should also be defined. Describe the approach for transitioning from design to manufacturing and specify data products which will be used to assure producibility and adequate tooling availability.

The approach, techniques, and facilities planned for integration, test and verification, and launch operations phases (including launch integration and processing), consistent with the proposed schedule and cost, should be described. A preliminary schedule for manufacturing, integration, and test activities should be included. A description of the planned end items, including engineering and qualification hardware and software, should be included.

If Radioisotope Thermoelectric Generators (RTG's) are necessary for the investigation, the following requirements apply. The parallel DOE preparation of the Radioisotope Thermoelectric Generator (RTG) power source for the flight system poses specific development interface issues. The ground equipment, simulators, control documents, and schedule constraints required to support the parallel development and test of the flight system and the RTG power subsystem shall be discussed. The unique requirements and procedures for integration of the power source at the launch site shall be presented. Any potential schedule issues associated with integration of the power system that are not within the contractor's control shall be identified, along with the expected impacts.

7. Mission Operations, Ground, and Data Systems. This section should discuss mission operations and the ground operations support required for the proposed investigation. The planned approach for managing mission operations and all flight operations support, including mission planning and scheduling, command sequence generation, uplink commanding, trajectory tracking, navigation, and telemetry downlink and analysis should be discussed. Describe the approach for emergency communications during any phase of the mission. Describe all inter-facility communications, computer security, or near real-time ground support requirements, licenses and/or approvals required, and indicate any special equipment or skills required of ground personnel. Provide a staffing plan for both mission operations and science payload operations. Proposers planning to utilize the Deep Space Mission System's (DSMS's) facilities (Deep Space Network [DSN] and Advanced Multi-Mission Operations System) are strongly advised to contact the DSMS Plans and Commitment Office during the Concept Study to better understand the options and associated costs for NASA-provided operations and communications services.

The approach to the development of the ground data system, including the use, if any, of existing facilities including Government facilities, should be described. All usage of the DSN and of any existing non-DSN facilities should be explicitly described (see *NASA's Mission Operations and Communications Services* document in the New Frontiers Program Library (NFPL) for specific requirements and contacts).. Any mission-unique facilities must be adequately described. Include a block diagram of the Ground Data System (GDS) showing the end-to-end concept (acquisition through archiving in the appropriate data archive) for operations and data flow to the subsystem level. Describe all communications, tracking, and ground support requirements; flight-ground trade studies; and integration and test plans. Describe the space/ground link spectrum requirements and the licensing approach. Proposers should contact an appropriate NASA Frequency Spectrum Management organization to ascertain licensing and frequency assignment requirements. An appropriate Spectrum Management organization is typically located in the organization providing Earth station or Tracking and Data Relay Satellite System (TDRSS) support. Describe the software design heritage and software development approach and its relationship to the flight system software development.

Specific features incorporated into the flight and ground system design that lead to low-cost operation should be identified. The use of any existing mission operations facilities and processes should be described, as well as any new facilities required to meet mission objectives.

8. Facilities. Provide a description of any new, or modifications to existing, facilities, laboratory equipment, and ground support equipment (GSE) (including those of the team's proposed contractors and those of NASA and other U.S. Government agencies) required to execute the investigation. The outline of new facilities and equipment should also indicate the lead time involved and the planned schedule for construction, modification, and/or acquisition of the facilities.

9. Product Assurance, Mission Assurance and Safety. This section should describe the process by which the product quality is assured to meet the proposer's specifications, including identification of trade studies, the parts selection strategy, and the plans to incorporate new technology. This section should also describe the product assurance plan, including plans for problem/failure reporting, inspections, quality control, parts selection and control, reliability, safety assurance, and software validation. Describe the risk mitigation efforts that address designing for long life, dormant reliability, and cold environment and radiation effects that include the RTG. Describe the radio science link and any ultrastable oscillator requirements and how the project plans to meet these requirements. In addition, investigators should be aware of mission assurance topics of recent Agency-level special emphasis for all NASA missions. Such topics include Red Team Reviews, subsystem-level Failure Mode Effects Analysis, Probabilistic Risk Assessment with its subset of analysis tools, Continuous Risk Management, and Software Independent Verification and Validation.

G. MANAGEMENT PLAN

This section sets forth the investigator's approach for managing the work, the recognition of essential management functions, and the overall integration of these functions. This section should specifically discuss the decision-making process to be used by the team, focusing particularly on the roles of the Principal Investigator (PI) and Project Manager (PM) in that process. Include a discussion of the relationship among the investigation team, the New Frontiers Program Office, and NASA Headquarters. The management plan should give insight into the organizations proposed for the work, including the internal operations and lines of authority with delegations, external interfaces and relationships with NASA, major subcontractors and partners, and associated investigators. It also should identify the institutional commitment of all team members (including team members responsible for E/PO), and the institutional roles and responsibilities. The use of innovative processes, techniques, and activities by mission teams in accomplishing their objectives is encouraged; however, they should be employed only when cost, schedule, or technical improvements can be demonstrated and specific enabling assumptions are identified.

1. Team Member Responsibilities. This section should describe the roles, responsibilities, time commitment, and experience of all team member organizations and key personnel, with particular emphasis placed on the responsibilities assigned to the PI, the PM, and other key personnel. In addition, information should be provided which indicates what percentage of time key personnel will devote to the mission, the duration of service, and how changes in personnel will be accomplished. (Note: The experience of the PI and science team members does not need to be included in this section since that is addressed in the science investigation section.)
 - a. Organizational Structure. The management organizational structure of the investigation team must be described in the CSR. A Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) must be provided. The CSR must describe the

responsibilities of each team member organization and its contributions to the investigation. Each key position, including its roles and responsibilities, how each key position fits into the organization, and the basic qualifications required for each position, must be described. A discussion of the unique or proprietary capabilities that each member organization brings to the team, along with a description of the availability of personnel at each partner organization to meet staffing needs should be included. The contractual and financial relationships between team partners should be discussed.

Summarize the relevant institutional experience in this section, and refer to supporting detail included in Section L, Relevant Experience and Past Performance. If experience for a partner is not equivalent to, or better than, the requirements for the proposed mission, explain how confidence can be gained that the mission requirements will be accomplished within cost and schedule constraints.

- b. Experience and Commitment of Key Personnel. Provide a history of experience explaining the relationship of the previous experience to each key individual's role; include the complexity of the work and the results.
 - i. Principal Investigator. The role(s), responsibilities, and time commitment of the Principal Investigator should be discussed. Provide a reference point of contact, including address and phone number.
 - ii. Project Manager and Deputy Project Manager. The roles, responsibilities, time commitment, and experience of the Project Manager and Deputy Project manager should be discussed. Provide reference points of contact for the Project Manager and Deputy Project Manager, including addresses and phone numbers.
 - iii. Other Key Personnel. The roles, responsibilities, time commitments, and experience of other key personnel in the investigation including Co-Investigators should be described.
2. Management Processes and Plans. This section should describe the management processes and plans necessary for the logical and timely pursuit of the work (including E/PO), accompanied by a description of the work plan. This section should also describe the proposed methods of hardware and software acquisition. The management processes which the investigator team proposes, including the relationship between organizations and key personnel should be discussed, including the following, as applicable: systems engineering and integration; requirements development; configuration management; schedule management; team member coordination and communication; progress reporting, both internal and to NASA; performance measurement; and resource management. This discussion should include all phases of the mission including preliminary analysis, technical definition, the design and development, and operations phases, along with the expected products and results from each phase. Unique tools, processes, or methods which will be used by the investigation team should be clearly identified and

their benefits discussed. All project elements should be covered to assure a clear understanding of project-wide implementation.

3. NEPA Compliance and Approval. The two separate, yet related, processes of NEPA Compliance and Launch Approval shall be discussed. The requirement to launch a plutonium-fuel RTG power source shall be incorporated in this discussion. A clear understanding of each process shall be presented, including the necessary documents to be prepared, reviews to be conducted, timing of the key process milestones, and identification of responsible agencies and organizations. Any project-unique risks posed by the investigation's implementation approach (e.g., a new LV, use of kick stages, etc.) must be identified. A proposed schedule, including all key milestones, shall be presented. Any exceptions to traditional NEPA/Launch Approval milestone scheduling required to match the schedules to the investigation's implementation constraints shall be noted.
4. Schedules. A detailed project schedule with the critical path(s) clearly delineated is required. The schedule and workflow for the complete mission life-cycle must be clearly defined, and the method and tools to be used for internal review, control, and direction discussed. Schedules for all major activities, interdependencies between major items, deliveries of end items, critical paths, schedule margins, and long-lead procurement needs (defined as hardware procurements required before the start of Phase C/D) should be clearly identified and discussed.
5. Risk Management. This section should describe the approach to, and plans for, risk management to be taken by the team, both in the overall mission design and in the individual systems and subsystems. Plans for using standard risk management tools, especially fault tree analysis, probabilistic risk assessments, and failure modes and effects analyses, should be described. Particular emphasis should be placed on describing how the various elements of risk, including new technologies used, will be managed to ensure successful accomplishment of the mission within cost and schedule constraints. Investigations dependent on new technology will be penalized for risk if adequate plans to ensure success of the investigation are not described. At least the top 3 risks and their mitigation plans should be discussed.

A summary of reserves in cost and schedule should be identified by Phase and project element and year and the rationale for them discussed. The specific means by which integrated costs, schedule, and technical performance will be tracked and managed should be defined. Specific reserves and the timing of their application should be described. Management of the reserves and margins, including who in the management organization manages the reserves and when and how the reserves are released, should be discussed. This should include the strategy for maintaining reserves as a function of cost-to-completion. All funded schedule margins should be identified. The relationship between the use of such reserves, margins, potential descope options, and their effect on cost, schedule, and performance should be fully discussed. When considering potential descope options, consider the

investigation as a total system including instrument(s), spacecraft, ground system, launch services, and operations.

6. Government Furnished Property, Services, Facilities, etc. This section should clearly delineate the Government-furnished property, services, facilities, etc. required to accomplish all phases of the mission.
7. Reviews. This section should list the major project reviews expected to be conducted during the project's life cycle and the approximate time frame of each. The objective of each review should be indicated. Allowance should also be made for government-initiated reviews including Confirmation Assessments as well as Independent Assessment Reviews, to be conducted on an approximate annual basis. The NFPO will plan to conduct these reviews in conjunction with planned Project reviews (e.g., PDR, CDR, etc.). It should be noted that regular reviews of the progress of the E/PO component of the missions should be held in the same way that progress on the scientific and technical aspects are reviewed.
8. Reporting. This section should clearly describe the approach to reporting progress to the Government and indicate the progress reviews the Government should attend to provide independent oversight. The process, including the individual or organization responsible for reporting integrated cost, schedule, and technical performance should be discussed. Planned project status reporting should include inputs to the monthly presentations to the governing Program Management Council (PMC), monthly status reporting to the New Frontiers Program Office, and, after the Project Critical Design Review (CDR), a brief weekly summary of progress via a web-based NASA Office of Space Science reporting site.
9. Software Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V). This section should describe the plan to comply with NPG 7120.5B and NPD 8730.4 for software IV&V. Discussion of the plan to task the NASA IV&V Facility in Fairmont, West Virginia to manage the conduct of IV&V for appropriate project-produced flight and ground software is required.

For Missions of Opportunity, in addressing the areas above, describe how the investigation team will interrelate with the sponsoring organization, organizationally, and managerially and provide:

- The status of the commitment from the spacecraft builder/owner or sponsoring organization to fly the proposed instrument or conduct the proposed investigation.
- If and how the proposed investigation relates to the spacecraft sponsor's overall mission objectives.

H. EDUCATION AND PUBLIC OUTREACH, TECHNOLOGY, AND SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS PLAN

The education and public outreach, technology, and small disadvantaged business plan should provide a summary of the benefits offered by the mission beyond the scientific benefits brought by obtaining and analyzing the desired scientific data.

1. Education and Public Outreach Activities. This section should build upon and extend the discussion of E/PO activities given in the proposal. See Appendix C of the AO for guidance. As noted earlier in these Guidelines, it is expected that the Concept Study plans will be substantially refined and expanded beyond the level of detail contained in the original proposal. Plans for product development and dissemination, contributions to the training of underserved and/or underutilized groups in science and technology, arrangements with partners, schedules and budgets for activities, and etc., are to be defined in sufficient detail that they can be evaluated at an appropriate level of depth. Where appropriate, references should be made to the Management Plan and other relevant sections for information on how the work is to be arranged, directed, implemented, reviewed, and reported. Letters of support/commitment from partners/subcontractors and resumes from key E/PO personnel should be included as appendices to the concept study report.
2. Small Disadvantaged Business. A summary plan is required specifying the proposed investigation's commitment to meet NASA's SDB participation goals as described in Section XIII of Appendix A of the AO. In addition, as also specified in Appendix A, subcontracting plans will be required to execute the contract option for investigation implementation.
3. Technology Infusion and/or Transfer. This section should discuss how the subject technology relates to the proposed investigation, from which project(s) the technology comes and its current level of technology readiness, modifications necessary in order to utilize the technology for this investigation, whether there are workarounds for the technology if plans for its usage on this investigation cannot be affirmed by PDR/Confirmation, and its potential value to the private sector in commercial or non-aerospace applications. The functions that the new technology performs and how it will be demonstrated for the investigation should be described. Also to be discussed is the development of partnerships among space, non-space firms, educational, other nonprofit organizations, and government entities to facilitate technology development, transfer, and commercialization along with how the mission team will implement the transfer and/or commercialization.

I. TECHNICAL DEFINITION (PHASE B) PLAN

This section should describe the plans and products for the technical definition phase (Phase B) of the Project. This section should identify the key mission tradeoffs and options to be investigated during the Phase B and should identify those issues, technologies, and decision points critical to mission success – including acquisition of long-lead items and the associated funding requirements. These plans should include a detailed schedule and define the products (including a Project Plan) and the schedule for their delivery.

J. COST PLAN FOR MISSION PHASES A THROUGH E

The CSR cost proposal should provide information on the anticipated costs for phases A through E for the preferred baseline launch date. A detailed cost proposal is required for Phase B. Cost estimates are required for the follow-on phases (C/D and E), including a description of the estimating techniques used to develop the cost estimates. A discussion of the basis of estimate should be provided with a discussion of heritage and commonality with other programs. Quantify and explain any cost savings that result from heritage. All costs, including all contributions made to the investigation, should be included. Full cost accounting for NASA facilities and personnel proposed must be submitted as directed in section 5 of the AO. Proposers should complete a summary of total mission cost by fiscal year as shown in **Figure 1**, Total Mission Cost Funding Profile. The purpose of this summary is to present all costs for the project *on one page*, by project phase (A through E), by participating organization, and by fiscal year. If obligation authority in excess of identified costs is required, the proposal must also indicate the authority needed by year.

In addition, for each phase of the investigation (A, B, C/D, and E) a Time Phased Cost Breakdown for each Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) element, as shown in **Figure 2**, should be completed. Use only the line items shown in Figure 2 that are relevant for each phase of the project. The purpose of this set of Figures is to provide detailed insight into how the project allocates funding during each phase of work.

The cost of the entire project should be summarized on one page, and presented in the format shown in **Figure 3**. The purpose of Figure 3 is to (1) provide detailed insight into project costs by cost element and (2) provide a basis for comparison of the project proposed cost with the evaluation team's independent cost analysis. Identify each reserve amount to the lowest level consistent with the proposed reserve management strategy. For example, if each subsystem manager will have spending authority over a reserve for the subsystem, each such amount should be identified separately. If more convenient, the reserve details may be shown in a separate table, with totals reported as shown in Figure 3. Show costs for all development elements by recurring and non-recurring components in the format of **Figure 4**. Show costs (NASA OSS and contributed) associated with each Co-Investigator in the format of **Figure 5**.

Proposers should include all contributions provided by non-OSS NASA Centers, including Civil Servant services, as well as the cost for the use of Government facilities and equipment on a full-cost accounting basis. All direct and indirect costs associated with the work performed at NASA Centers should be fully costed and accounted for in the proposal and summarized using the template provided in **Figure 6**. The purpose of this data is twofold: 1) to determine those costs that are included in the NASA OSS cost but are not funded out of the New Frontiers program, and 2) to determine civil service contributions that are not included in the NASA OSS cost. Teams should work with their respective NASA Centers to develop estimates for these costs.

Note that the definitions for cost element terms shown in the cost figures are provided in the *Program Cost Elements* document in the NFPL.

The inflation index provided in Appendix B (Table B3) of the AO should be used to calculate all real-year dollar amounts, unless an industry forward pricing rate is used. If something other than the provided inflation index is used, the rates used should be documented.

All costs shall include all burdens and profit/fee in real-year dollars by fiscal year, assuming the inflation rates used by NASA (provided above) or specifically identified industry forward pricing rates.

1. Phase B Cost Proposal. This section provides a detailed cost proposal for performing the Phase B study. Detailed plans for the study should be described, but reference may be made to the Technical Approach and Management sections of the proposal, as appropriate.
 - a. Contract Pricing Proposal. Cost or pricing data is required for Phase B. Completed cost or pricing data must be included with the CSR proposal for each organization participating in the Phase B study and must be signed by each organization's authorized representative. This requirement may be satisfied with one form provided that all institutions involved in the Phase B study are included with the appropriate signatures. The contract pricing proposal for Phase B may be provided as an appendix (see section K).
 - b. Work Breakdown Structure. A Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) should be included for Phase B. The structure of the WBS should be consistent with the plans set forth in the Technical Approach and Management sections of the proposal and the Statement of Work provided as an Appendix to the proposal.
 - c. Workforce Staffing Plan. Provide a workforce-staffing plan that is consistent with the WBS. This workforce-staffing plan should include all team member organizations and should cover all management, technical (scientific and engineering), and support staff. The workforce-staffing plan should be phased by month. Time commitments for the PI, PM, Deputy PM, and other key personnel should be clearly shown.
 - d. Proposal Pricing Technique. Describe the process and techniques used to develop the Phase B cost proposal. Provide a description of the cost-estimating model(s) and techniques used in the Phase B cost estimate. Discuss the heritage of the models and/or techniques applied to this estimate, including any known differences between missions contained in the model's data base and key attributes of the proposed mission. Include the assumptions used as the basis for the Phase B cost and identify those which are critical to cost sensitivity in the investigation. Identify any "discounts" assumed in the cost estimates for business practice initiatives or streamlined technical approaches. Describe how these have been incorporated in the cost estimate and will be managed by the investigation team.

- e. Phase B Time-Phased Cost Summary. Provide a summary of the total Phase B costs consistent with Figure 2. Phase B costs also appear in Figure 3, and in Figure 4 if development work is planned during Phase B. The Phase B cost summary should be developed consistent with the WBS and should include all costs to NASA along with all contributed costs. The Phase B time phased cost summary should be phased by month.
- f. Cost Elements Breakdown. To effectively evaluate the Phase B cost proposals, NASA requires costs and supporting evidence stating the basis for the estimated costs. The proposal will include, but is not limited to:
 - i. Direct Labor.
 - (1) Explain the basis of labor-hour estimates for each of the labor classifications.
 - (2) State the number of productive work-hours per month.
 - (3) Provide a schedule of the direct labor rates used in the proposal. Discuss the basis for developing the proposed direct labor rates for the team member organizations involved; the forward-pricing method (including midpoint, escalation factors, anticipated impact of future union contracts, etc.); and elements included in the rates, such as overtime, shift differential, incentives, allowances, etc.
 - (4) If available, submit evidence of Government approval of direct labor rates for proposal purposes for each labor classification for the proposed performance period.
 - (5) If Civil Servant labor is to be used in support of the Phase B study, but is not to be charged directly to the investigation, then this labor must be considered as a contribution by a domestic partner, subject to the same restrictions as other contributions by domestic or foreign partners. A discussion of the source of funding for the Civil Servant contributions must be provided.
 - ii. Direct Material. Submit a summary of material and parts costs for each element of the WBS.
 - iii. Subcontracts. Identify fully each effort (task, item, etc. by WBS element) to be subcontracted, and list the selected or potential subcontractors, locations, amount budgeted/proposed and types of contracts. Explain the adjustments, if any, and the indirect rates (or burdens) applied to the subcontractors' proposed amounts anticipated. Describe fully the cost analysis or price analysis and the negotiations conducted regarding the proposed subcontracts.
 - iv. Other Direct Costs.
 - (1) Travel, Relocation, and Related Costs. Provide a summary of the travel and relocation costs including the number of trips, duration, and purpose of the trips.
 - (2) Computer. Provide a summary of all unique computer-related costs.
 - (3) Consultants. Indicate the specific task area or problem requiring consultant services. Identify the proposed consultants, and state the quoted daily rate, the estimated number of days and associated costs (such as travel), if any. State whether the

consultant has been compensated at the quoted rate for similar services performed in connection with Government contracts.

- (4) Other. Explain and support any other direct costs included in the Phase B proposal in a manner similar to that described above.

v. Indirect Costs.

- (1) List all indirect expense rates for the team member organizations. Indirect expense rates (in the context of this AO) include labor overhead, material overhead, general and administrative (G&A) expenses, and any other cost proposed as an allocation to the proposed direct costs.
- (2) If the proposal includes support services for which off-site burden rates are used, provide a schedule of the off-site burden rates. Include a copy of the company policy regarding off-site vs. on-site effort.
- (3) If available, submit evidence of Government approval of any/all projected indirect rates for the proposed period of performance. Indicate the status of rate negotiations with the cognizant Government agency, and provide a comparative listing of approved bidding rates and negotiated actual rates for the past five (5) fiscal years.
- (4) Discuss the fee arrangements for the major team partners.

2. Design/Development (Phase C/D) Cost Estimate. This section provides a cost estimate for performing the Design/Development Phase (Phase C/D) portion of the mission. The Phase C/D cost estimates should correlate with the plans set forth in the Science, Technical Approach, and Management sections of the proposal. In completing this section, the following guidelines will apply:

- a. Work Breakdown Structure. A Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) should be included for Phase C/D. The WBS shall be described to the subsystem level (i.e., Attitude Control System, Propulsion System, Structure and Mechanisms, etc.) for the spacecraft and to the instrument level for the payload. All other elements of the WBS should be to the major task level (Project Management, Systems Engineering, Ground Support Equipment, education and public outreach, etc.).
- b. Cost Estimating Technique. Describe the process and techniques used to develop the Phase C/D cost estimate. Provide a description of the cost-estimating model(s) and techniques used in the Phase C/D cost estimate. Discuss the heritage of the models applied to this estimate including any known differences between missions contained in the model's data base and key attributes of the proposed mission. Include the assumptions used as the basis for the Phase C/D cost and identify those that are critical to the cost sensitivity in the investigation. Identify any "discounts" assumed in the cost estimates for business practice initiatives or streamlined technical approaches and the basis for these discounts. Describe how these have been incorporated in the cost estimate and will be managed by the investigation team.

- c. Workforce Staffing Plan. Provide a workforce-staffing plan (including civil service) which is consistent with WBS. This workforce-staffing plan should include all team member organizations and should cover all management, manufacturing, technical (scientific and engineering), education and public outreach, and support staff. The workforce-staffing plan should be phased by fiscal year. Time commitments for the PI, PM, and other key personnel should be clearly shown.
 - d. Phase C/D Time-Phased Cost Summary. Provide a summary of the total Phase C/D costs consistent with Figure 2. The Phase C/D cost summary should be developed consistent with the WBS and should include all costs to NASA, along with all contributed costs. The Phase C/D time-phased cost summary should be phased by fiscal year. Also report Phase C/D costs in Figures 3 and 4. Phase C/D extends 30 days beyond launch so be sure to account for all costs for this period, including tracking support and mission operations.
3. Mission Operations (Phase E) Cost Estimate. This section provides a cost estimate for performing the Mission Operations for Phase E including Education and Public Outreach. In completing this section, the guidelines for Phase C/D apply. Proposers may refer to the information provided in *NASA's Mission Operations and Communications Services* document in the NFPL for mission operations and communications costs, if NASA systems are proposed. Since the best possible cost estimates are desired, the contacts listed in the subject document should be consulted to assure accuracy as well as credibility.
 4. Total Mission Cost (TMC) Estimate. This section should summarize the estimated costs to be incurred in Phases A through E including: Concept Study (Phase A), Technical Definition (Phase B); Design and Development Phase (Phase C/D); Mission Operations and Data Analysis Phase (Phase E); Launch vehicle, upper stages, and launch services; Deep Space Network and other ground system costs; and cost of activities associated for social or educational benefits (if not incorporated in any of Phases A through E). Figure 1 should be used to summarize these costs. The total mission cost estimate should be developed consistent with the Work Breakdown Structure. Detailed plans for any aspects of the mission not discussed elsewhere in the CSR should be discussed here. The funding profile should be optimized for the mission. Contributions not included in the NASA OSS cost should be clearly identified as separate line items.
 5. Total E/PO Cost Estimate: This section should summarize the estimated costs to be incurred in Phases A through E of the investigation for the E/PO component. This summary should be consistent with and relate directly to the top-level E/PO budget lines in Figures 1-6 as appropriate and describe how these costs relate to the activities, products, programs, partnership arrangements, etc., defined in Section H.

Note that immediately following downselection, NASA will award a letter contract based upon the detailed estimated costs for Phase B and will request a formal cost

proposal with detailed cost information for the subsequent mission phases. The contractor will be requested to submit a formal cost proposal based upon the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 15. The instructions and format for submission of this proposal are found in FAR Part 15.403-5 and Table 15.2. It is essential that the cost elements proposed in the formal contract proposal for contract award be traceable to the cost proposal provided in the CSR. Any changes in costs from the concept study proposal should be described in detail. The definitized contract will include an option provision for Phase C/D and E with a not-to-exceed amount for each phase.

Figure 1
TOTAL MISSION COST FUNDING

FY Costs in Real Year Dollars (to nearest thousand), Totals in RY and Fixed Year '03 Dollars

Cost Element **	Formulation		Formulation		Implementation			Implementation		TOTAL	
	FY1	FYx	*RY \$	FY03\$	FY1	É	FYz	*RY \$	FY03\$	RY \$	FY03\$
Start to Launch + 30 Days (Phases A/B/C/D)	Enter each cost element										
Phase A Concept Study											
Proj. Mgmt/Miss. Analysis/Sys.											
Eng. Instrument A											
Instrument B											
Instrument É											
Instr. Integration, Assembly and Test											
<i>Subtotal - Instruments</i>											
Spacecraft bus											
S/C Integration, Assembly and Test											
Other Hardware Elements (1)											
Launch Ops (Launch +30 days)											
<i>Subtotal - Spacecraft</i>											
Science Team Support											
Pre-Launch GD S/MOS Development											
DSN/Tracking											
Other (2)											
<i>Subtotal Phases A-D before Reserves</i>											
Instrument Reserves											
Spacecraft Reserves											
Other Reserves											
Total Phases A/B/C/D											
Launch + 30 Days to End of Mission (Phase E)	Enter each cost element										
Mission Operations & Data Analysis (including Project Management)											
DSN/Tracking											
Other (2)											
<i>Subtotal Phase E before Reserves</i>											
Reserves											
Total Phase E											
Launch Services											
Phase F (Extended Mission if Applicable)											
Total NASA Cost											
Contributions (2)											
Total Contributions											
Total Mission Cost =										→	

- (1) Other Hardware Elements: Probes, Sample Return Canister,
 (2) Specify each item on a separate line; include Education & Public Outreach, Tech Infusion/Transfer, facilities, etc.
 Note: Formulation = Phase A + B; Implementation = Phase C + D +
 * See *Program Cost Elements* document in Program Library

FIGURE 2
(Phased costs in Real Year Dollars, Totals in Real Year and FY2004 Dollars)

TIME PHASED COST BREAKDOWN BY WBS AND MAJOR COST CATEGORY					
WBS/Cost Category Description	FY1	FY2	...	Total (RY\$)	Total (FY2004\$)
Total Direct Labor Cost	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
WBS 1.0 Management					
WBS 2.0 Spacecraft					
WBS 2.1 Structures & Mechanisms					
WBS 2.2 Propulsion					
etc.					
Total Subcontract Costs	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
WBS # and Description					
:					
etc.					
Total Materials & Equipment Cost	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
WBS # and Description					
:					
etc.					
Total Reserves	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
WBS # and Description					
:					
etc.					
Total Other Costs	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
WBS # and Description					
:					
etc.					
Fee					
E/PO, Other (Specify)					
Total Contract Cost	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Total Other Costs to NASA OSS	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Launch Services					
Ground Segment					
E/PO, Other (Specify)					
Total Contributions (Non-U.S. or U.S.)	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Organization A:					
WBS # and Description					
etc.					
Organization B:					
WBS # and Description					
etc.					
TOTAL COST FOR PHASE	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$

Figure 3 Fiscal Year Costs in Fiscal Year 2004 Dollars (to nearest thousand)

(Totals in Real Year and Fiscal Year 2004 Dollars)

Cost Element	FY1	FY2	FY3	...	FYn	Total (FY2004\$)	Total (RY\$)
Phase A							
Reserves							
Total Phase A							
Phase B							
Reserves							
Total Phase B							
Phase C/D							
Instrument A							
Instrument B							
Instr Integ, Assy & Test							
<i>Subtotal - Instruments</i>							
Spacecraft Bus							
Spacecraft Integ, Assy & Test							
Other Hardware Elements							
Launch Ops							
<i>Subtotal - Spacecraft</i>							
Proj Mgmt/Miss Analysis/Sys Eng							
Science Team Support							
Prelaunch GDS/MOS Development							
E/PO, Other*							
<i>Subtotal Phase C/D before Reserves</i>							
Instrument Reserves							
Spacecraft Reserves							
Other Reserves							
Total Phase C/D							
Phase E							
MO&DA							
Tracking Services (Earth Station or TDRSS)							
E/PO, Other*							
<i>Subtotal Phase E before Reserves</i>							
Reserves							
Total Phase E							
Launch Services							
Total NASA OSS Cost	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Contributions*							
Total Contributions	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Total Mission Cost							\$

*Specify each item on a separate line; include Education & Public Outreach, facilities, etc.

Figure 4
Phase C/D Development Costs
in Real Year Dollars (to nearest thousand)

Cost Element	Non-Recurring	Recurring	Total (RY\$)	Total (FY2004\$)
Instrument A *				
Instrument B*				
Instrument n *				
<i>Subtotal - Instruments</i>				
Structure and Mechanisms				
Attitude Control				
Power				
Subsystem n				
<i>Subtotal - Spacecraft Bus</i>				
Any other elements (specify)*				
<i>Subtotal - Other elements</i>				
Total NASA OSS Development Cost				

* Other elements: probes, sample return canister, etc. Specify each instrument by subsystem/components where possible

FIGURE 5
CO-INVESTIGATOR COMMITMENT AND COST
FUNDING PROFILE TEMPLATE
(FY costs in Real Year Dollars, Totals in Real Year and FY2004 Dollars)

	Phase B	Phase C/D	Phase E	Total (Real Year)	Total (FY 2004)
<i>NASA OSS Cost</i>					
Co-I #1 Name/Organization					
Percent Time					
Cost					
Co-I #2 Name/Organization					
Percent Time					
Cost					
Co-I #n Name/Organization					
Percent Time					
Cost					
Total NASA OSS Co-I Cost					
<i>Contributions</i>					
Co-I #1 Name/Organization					
Percent Time					
Cost					
Co-I #2 Name/Organization					
Percent Time					
Cost					
Co-I #n Name/Organization					
Percent Time					
Cost					
Total Contributed Co-I Cost					

FIGURE 6
NASA CIVIL SERVICE COSTS
FUNDING PROFILE TEMPLATE
(FY costs in Real Year Dollars, Totals in Real Year and FY2004 Dollars)

Item	FY1	FY2	FY3	FY4	FY5	FYn	...	Total (Real Yr.)	Total (FY 2004)
Workforce	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
- NASA Center A									
- NASA Center B									
- etc.									
Facilities	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
- NASA Center A									
E/PO, Other*	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
- NASA Center A									
NASA Civil Service Costs included in NASA OSS Cost	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Contributions by NASA Centers									
Workforce	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
- NASA Center A									
- NASA Center B	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
- etc.	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Facilities									
- NASA Center A									
E/PO, Other*									
- NASA Center A									
Contributed NASA Civil Service costs	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Mission Totals								\$	

*Specify each item on a separate line.

K. APPENDICES

The following additional information is required to be supplied with the Concept Study Report. This information can be included as Appendices to the CSR, and, as such, will not be counted within the specified page limit.

1. Letters of Endorsement. Letters of endorsement must be provided from all organizations participating in and critical to the investigation, including the JPL Interplanetary Network Directorate (for the DSN), the KSC Launch Vehicle Support Office, subcontractors, and E/PO partners). Letters of endorsement should be signed by both the lead representative from each organization represented on the team, and by institutional and Government officials authorized to commit their organizations to participation in the proposed investigation. Signed letters of support or commitment must be provided from all E/PO partners or subcontractors detailing their commitment to or involvement in the education and public outreach effort.
2. Relevant Experience and Past Performance. Relevant experience and past performance (successes and failures) of the major team partners in meeting cost and schedule constraints in similar projects within the last ten years should be discussed. A description of each project, its relevance to the proposed investigation, cost and schedule performance, and points of contact (including addresses and phone numbers), should be provided.
3. Resumes. Provide resumes for all key personnel identified in the Management section. Also provide resumes for key E/PO lead personnel. Include resume data on experience that relates to the job these personnel will be doing for the proposed investigation.
4. Statements of Work for each Contract Option. Provide draft Statement(s) of Work for all potential contracts with NASA. These Statement(s) of Work should (as a minimum) be for each contract option (i.e., Phase B, Phase C/D, and Phase E) and clearly define all proposed deliverables (including science data) for each option, potential requirements for Government facilities and/or Government services, and a proposed schedule for each option and the entire mission.
5. Mission Definition and Requirements Agreement. A Mission Definition and Requirements Agreement should be provided that defines the roles and responsibilities of the major implementing partners of the mission project. The agreement submitted must be signed by institutional officials who have the authority to make the institutional commitments defined. This multiparty agreement will be considered a draft that can be finalized with appropriate NASA signatures if the project is selected to proceed. The information contained in this document will be the primary source of top-level programmatic responsibilities and requirements (science requirements, mission/project requirements, schedule milestones, etc.) for the development of subsequent New Frontiers program requirements documentation (e.g., Level I requirements, Project Plan, and Project Implementation Plan).. An

example of a Mission Definition and Requirements Agreement is provided in the NFPL.

6. Radioactive Power Sources Plan (as applicable). Use of radioactive sources of power will require additional environmental documentation [see National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*); Executive Order 12114 "Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Federal Actions"; Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508); and NASA policies and procedures at 14 CFR Subpart 1216.3]. In addition, documentation is required to support NASA's request for Nuclear Safety Launch Approval in accordance with Presidential Directive/National Security Council-25 (PD/NSC-25). Provide a detailed plan and schedule that outlines the approach for implementing these requirements.
7. Planetary Protection Approach. Early in the Phase A Concept Study, investigation teams are encouraged to work with NASA's Planetary Protection Officer to verify/determine the appropriate planetary protection category and any special considerations and/or study requirements that may exist. Provide an approach to planetary protection consistent with *NPG 8020.12B, Planetary Protection Provisions for Robotic Extraterrestrial Missions*, available through the NFPL. Outline any special requirements on personnel, instrumentation, spacecraft assembly, facilities, launch configuration, or mission operations.
8. Incentive Plan(s). Draft Incentive Plans (if applicable) should be included with the concept study. Incentive Plans should outline contractual incentive features for all major team members. Incentive Plans should include both performance and cost incentives, as appropriate.
9. NASA PI Proposing Teams. The same guidelines as in AO Appendix B apply.
10. Technical Content of any International Agreement(s). A brief description of the technical content of the contribution of each non-U.S. partner is required. This information should be of a form that will allow it to be easily incorporated into an International Agreement(s) by NASA.
11. Discussion on Compliance with U.S. Export Laws and Regulations. Provide an update to the discussion in the proposal. Investigations that include international participation, either through involvement of non-U.S. nationals and/or involvement of non-U.S. entities must include a section discussing compliance with U.S. export laws and regulations; e.g., 22 CFR 120-130, *et seq.* and 15 CFR 730-774, *et seq.*, as applicable to the scenario surrounding the particular international participation. The discussion must describe in detail the proposed international participation and is to include, but not be limited to, whether or not the international participation may require the proposer to obtain the prior approval of the Department of State or the Department of Commerce via a technical assistance agreement or an export license, or whether a license exemption/exception may apply. If prior approvals via licenses are necessary, discuss whether the license has been applied for or if not, the projected timing of the application and any implications for the schedule. Information regarding U.S. export regulations is available through Internet URLs

<http://www.pmdtc.org> and <http://www.bxa.doc.gov>. Proposers are advised that under U.S. law and regulation, spacecraft and their specifically designed, modified or configured systems, components, parts, etc., such as the instrumentation being sought under this AO, are generally considered “Defense Articles” on the United States Munitions List and subject to the provisions of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations, 22 CFR 120-130, *et seq.*

12. Additional Activities in Response to 7120.5B. NASA recognizes that the response to 7120.5B may not have been fully appreciated by all proposers at the time of release of the AO. We believe, however, that the requirements in NPG 7120.5A as well as most Center and JPL requirements have not appreciably changed with the latest revision. Since 7120.5B MUST be adhered to with all New Frontiers missions to achieve approval for implementation, it is imperative to assure that all proposers have assessed their projects against this document. This appendix offers some page count relief in addressing significant changes (if any), from what was originally proposed. Since the identification and justification of these activities is in an appendix, brief but adequate definition, description, and justification is the objective. Note, however, that to a great extent the response should really be a less visible part of the mission concept, and thus already covered in proposal and the Concept Study Report main sections. Some of the response, however, may be singularly noteworthy and discussed here. For example, one of the existing key requirements (see Section G, paragraph 8 of these guidelines) involves hardware and software verification and validation (including IV&V where appropriate). Proposers should note that a point of contact for discussion of this requirement is Ken Costello at GSFC (phone: 304-367-8343; email: ken.costello@ivv.nasa.gov).
13. Communications Link Budget Design Data. Include communications block diagram and link budget design control tables for all radio communications links (data and carrier) showing relevant spacecraft and earth station parameters and assumptions for the maximum distance and/or throughput at which each particular link could be used. With particularity, provide losses, loop bandwidths, coding, antenna gains, and such other parameters as are identified in the document *NASA’s Mission Operations and Communication Services*, in the NFPL.
14. Cost and Pricing for Phase B Contract. To assure that the deliverables via the CSR facilitate a direct and easily implementable Phase B contract, proposers must provide cost and pricing data for Phase B which meet the requirements of the FAR Part 15 Table 15-2 (see the NFPL section on Directives and Procurement-related Information). This Phase B cost and pricing data is necessary and required to implement the contract. This data is in addition to the data provided in Cost figures 1-6 for evaluation purposes, allocates project costs per the cost categories defined in Table 15-2, but still align at the highest levels with the evaluation data. Also see Section J of Part II above for additional guidance.
15. Additional Cost Data to Assist Validation. In addition to the specific cost table data requested in the Cost Proposal, Section J, proposers should also provide any additional costing information/data which they feel will assist NASA to validate

- the projects' proposed costs. Vendor quotes, cost estimates, rationale for design heritage cost savings, are all examples of data that can be included here. However, in specific, all costs to the lowest level of the proposers' WBS should be provided in an EXCEL or equivalent format.
16. Science Change Matrix. Should the Phase A effort result in any science change (including a science implementation change) from that originally proposed, provide the new requirement, the old requirement, the rationale for the change, and the section/paragraph where the change occurs in the CSR.
 17. Data Management Plan Approach Although no Project Data Management Plan is required for delivery via the Concept Study, this plan will be required at PDR. In the Concept Study Report, however, proposers must discuss all plans (schedules, costs, and deliverables) and their approach and commitment to delivering project data to the appropriate NASA data archives and indicate such in the plans and schedules for Phase B14. In addition, this discussion must provide assurance that that all activities (womb to tomb) have been considered and included with appropriate resources separately allocated and budgeted.
 18. Project Plan Approach. Although the Project Plan is not required for delivery as part of the CSR, the CSR should indicate the approach to complete this activity prior to Confirmation to enter Phase C/D. The Project Plan, written according to NPG 7120.5B, is a required product for Confirmation.
 19. Orbital Debris Analysis. No orbital debris analysis is required with the Concept Study Report, however, this analysis will be required for PDR and CDR per NPD 8710.3, NASA Policy for Limiting Orbital Debris Generation. This document can be found in the NODIS library via the NFPL.
 20. References List (Optional) Phase A Concept Study Reports may provide, as an appendix, a list of reference documents and materials used in the concept study. The documents and materials themselves cannot be submitted, except as a part of the concept study.
 21. Abbreviations/Acronyms List. To aid the evaluation effort, every abbreviation/acronym used in the Concept Study Report should be included in this table even if it has been defined at first usage in the Report.